

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
9 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
10 **SAN JOSE DIVISION**  
11

12 AURELIO SALAZAR, et al.,

13 Plaintiffs,

14 v.

15 MONTEREY COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, et al.,

16 Defendants.  
17

Case No. C-03-03584 JF

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE  
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION;  
TEMPORARY ORDER RESTRAINING  
MAILING OF OVERSEAS BALLOTS

18 Plaintiffs seek a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction prohibiting  
19 Defendants from going forward with the special election on Proposition 54 (also known as the  
20 Classification by Race, Ethnicity, Color or National Origin (CRECNO) Initiative) currently  
21 scheduled for October 7, 2003 and from conducting any election to decide Proposition 54 other  
22 than on March 2, 2004. The Court has read and considered the legal briefing submitted on behalf  
23 of the parties as well as the oral arguments presented by counsel at a hearing on August 15, 2003.

24 Defendants concede that the state's decision to place Proposition 54 on the same  
25 statewide ballot as the vote on the recall of the Governor is a change in voting procedures within  
26 the meaning of Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, 42 U.S.C. § 1973c ("Section 5"); that  
27 Monterey County is a covered jurisdiction pursuant to the Voting Rights Act, see Lopez v. Monterey  
28

1 County, 519 U.S. 9, 12 (1996)<sup>1</sup>; that accordingly Monterey County must obtain preclearance of such  
2 changes from the United States Department of Justice or the United States District Court for the  
3 District of Columbia prior to enacting or seeking to administer them; and that in the absence of such  
4 preclearance neither Monterey County nor the state may proceed with the October 7, 2003 election.  
5 Plaintiffs ask the Court to restrain any further preparations for the election immediately; Defendants ask  
6 that the Court refrain from entering any order based upon their expectation that the Department of  
7 Justice will act on their request for preclearance “well before” the election.

8 Plaintiffs argue that permitting Defendants to obtain Section 5 preclearance after the changes in  
9 question already have been implemented undermines a primary purpose of the Voting Rights Act, which  
10 is to ensure that covered jurisdictions do not implement changes in voting procedures until preclearance  
11 has been obtained. They assert that permitting preparations for the October 7, 2003 election to go  
12 forward improperly rewards Defendants for their alleged lack of diligence in seeking preclearance and  
13 subjects the Department of Justice to undue pressure to grant preclearance and that even preparatory  
14 actions being undertaken by Defendants in anticipation of the election violate the extremely broad  
15 provisions of the Voting Rights Act. They acknowledge, however, that the Department of Justice has  
16 authority to entertain Defendants’ current effort to obtain preclearance and that the basis for any  
17 injunctive relief from this Court will dissipate if and when such preclearance is obtained.

18 Defendants contend that the public interest in allowing the electoral process to proceed is  
19 compelling, that even a temporary interruption of their preparations for the October 7, 2003 election by  
20 this Court would have the practical effect of delaying the election even if preclearance ultimately is  
21 obtained, that they in fact sought preclearance as soon as it was practicable to do so following the  
22 certification of the special election on the recall of the Governor, and that allowing the Department of  
23 Justice a reasonable time within which to consider their request while at the same time allowing election  
24 preparations to go forward appropriately balances the interests at stake.

---

25  
26 <sup>1</sup>Three other California counties—Kings, Merced and Yuba—also are covered jurisdictions but  
27 are not parties to the instant case. Counsel for the state advises that a request for preclearance on  
28 behalf of these jurisdictions is pending.

1 In a case such as this, the role of the district court is limited to a determination of 1) whether a  
2 change in voting procedures triggers the preclearance requirement of Section 5, 2) whether  
3 preclearance has been obtained, and 3) what temporary remedy, if any, is appropriate.  
4 Lopez v. Monterey County, 519 U.S. at 23. The Court's goal "must be to ensure that the covered  
5 jurisdiction submits its election plan to the appropriate federal authorities for preclearance as  
6 expeditiously as possible." Id. at 24. It is clear in the present case both that the preclearance  
7 requirement of Section 5 applies and that Defendants have not yet obtained preclearance. The only  
8 question, therefore, is the appropriate extent of equitable relief.

9 This Court is extremely reluctant to intervene in or disrupt the electoral process unless it clearly  
10 is compelled to do so. At the same time, permitting voting or other forms of direct political participation  
11 to be affected by changes in voting procedures implemented in contravention of the Voting Rights Act  
12 cannot be countenanced. Having considered the practical realities of the election process in light of  
13 these principles, the Court finds for present purposes that the interests at risk if the election process is  
14 permitted to proceed up to the point at which actual voting or other direct participation is implicated are  
15 substantially outweighed by a compelling public interest in proceeding with the election as presently  
16 scheduled, but that thereafter injunctive relief will be warranted in the absence of Section 5  
17 preclearance. In the case of Proposition 54, voting is implicated first by Defendant Monterey County's  
18 stated intention to mail absentee ballots to registered voters residing overseas as soon as possible and  
19 thereafter by the commencement of general absentee voting on September 8, 2003. Direct  
20 participation is implicated by the August 31, 2003 deadline established by the state for public review of  
21 the ballot pamphlet that will contain the arguments for and against Proposition 54.

22 Accordingly, and good cause therefor appearing, Defendants shall appear before this Court at  
23 3:00 PM on Friday, August 29, 2003, there and then to show cause, if any they have, why they, their  
24 agents, servants, employees and those in active concert or participation with them, should not be  
25 restrained and enjoined pending trial of this action from accepting any ballots, including absentee  
26 ballots, or operating any polling place in connection with the special election on Proposition 54 currently  
27 scheduled for October 7, 2003. Counsel for Defendants shall advise the Court and opposing counsel

1 immediately of the substance of any and all communications from the United States Department of  
2 Justice concerning the status of Defendants' request for Section 5 preclearance.

3 Pending the hearing, Defendant Monterey County is restrained from mailing absentee ballots to  
4 overseas voters registered to vote in Monterey County until Section 5 preclearance has been obtained  
5 or until further order of the Court.<sup>2</sup> An undertaking shall not be required.

6 This Order shall be served on Defendants on or before August 18, 2003, and proof of service  
7 must be filed on or before August 20, 2003. Any response or opposition must be filed and served by  
8 facsimile on Plaintiffs' counsel on or before August 26, 2003; any reply to such response or opposition  
9 must be filed and served by facsimile on Defendants' counsel on or before August 28, 2003. Because  
10 counsel have submitted substantial briefing and provided the Court with extended legal argument in  
11 connection with Plaintiffs' application for a temporary restraining order, briefing with respect to this  
12 Order to Show Cause shall be limited to the response, if any, that Defendants have received from the  
13 United States Department of Justice to their request for preclearance pursuant to Section 5 of the  
14 Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the legal effect of such response or lack thereof on the issues presented  
15 by the instant case.

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  

---

23 <sup>2</sup>The purpose of this limited restraining order is to ensure that no person who casts a vote with  
24 respect to the October 7, 2003 election does so pursuant to voting procedures that have not been  
25 precleared pursuant to Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. The Court notes that Monterey County  
26 already has missed the statutory deadline for mailing absentee ballots to overseas voters and that this  
27 order will further shorten the time available for mailing ballots to the voters in question, but it concludes  
28 that it has no other alternative in view of the fact that the October 7, 2003 election cannot proceed in  
the absence of Section 5 preclearance. The Court expresses no opinion as to what remedies, if any,  
may be available to such voters under California law.

1 IT IS SO ORDERED.

2  
3 DATED: August 15, 2003

(electronic signature authorized)

4 JEREMY FOGEL  
United States District Judge

Copies of this Order have been served upon the following persons:

Joaquin Guadalupe Avila  
javila@quixnet.net

Leroy W. Blankenship  
blankenshipl@co.monterey.ca.us

Jill Bowers  
Jill.Bowers@doj.ca.gov

Wynne S. Carvill  
wcarvill@thelenreid.com

Laura R. Garrett  
Lgarrett@thelenreid.com

Leslie R. Lopez  
Leslie.lopez@doj.ca.gov Patricia.galvan@doj.ca.gov

Louis R. Mauro  
louis.mauro@doj.ca.gov

Thomas A. Saenz  
tsaenz@maldef.org lsilva@maldef.org

Katherine C. Zarate  
kzarate@thelenreid.com

Maria Blanco  
Mexican American Legal Defense & Educational Fund  
926 "J" Street, #422  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Bill Lockyer  
Kenneth R. Williams  
California Attorney General  
1300 I Street  
PO Box 944255  
Sacramento, CA 94244-2550

1 Steven J. Reyes  
2 Hector O. Villagra  
3 Victor Viramontes  
4 Mexican American Legal Defense & Educational Fund  
5 634 South Spring St., 11th Floor  
6 Los Angeles, CA 90014

7 Robert Rubin  
8 Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights  
9 of the San Francisco Bay Area  
10 131 Steuart Street, Suite #400  
11 San Francisco, CA 94105  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28